of the species came from the Haslar collection, its habitat being unknown.

Hearl, 33 in length; depth, $1 \frac{3}{4}$. D. circa, 88 (injured); A. 64 ( 62 to 66). Lat. l. about 80 . Mouth very small, the maxillary $3 \frac{4}{5}$ in head. Interorbital space concave, rather broad, its width $3 \frac{1}{2}$ in head. Eyes large, the lower considerably before the upper: its diameter $3 \frac{1}{2}$ in head.

Lateral line with a short sharp curve anteriorly. Gill-rakers very small. Anterior rays of dorsal not elevated. Left pectoral not produced, little longer than right, $1 \frac{1}{4}$ in head.

Coloration highly variegated with different shades of gray, the pale blotches rounded, very irregular in size and position. No distinct black spots along the lateral line. A large whitish clond between the eyes.

Blind side pale, scaled like the eyed side.
U. S. National Museum, July 2S, 1884.

## A REVIEW OF THE AMERICAN SPECIES OF MARINE MUGILID止. <br> By DAVIT S. JOREAN and JOSTPIESWAIN.

In the present paper is given the synonymy of the species of Mugilidoe known to inhabit the salt and brackish waters of America, with analytical keys by which the species and genera may be distinguished. Five of the species of Mugil are also described in full.

The marine Mugilide of America fall naturally in to three genera, which may be thus distinguished:
a. Anal spines three; teeth eiliiform, flexible; stomach muscular, gizzarl like.
b. Cleft of month chiefly anterior; lower jaw broad; cilia in one or few series.

Mugil, 1.
bb. Cleft of mouth lateral; lower jaw narrow ; cilia in very many series, pave-ment-like; npper lip rery thick; no adipose eyelid; vertical fins sealy.

Сhenomugil, 2.
aa. Anal spines two, the first soft ray simple, but distinetly articulate; teeth distinet, scarcely ciliiform; lips thin ; no adipose eyelid ; vertical tins, not sealy; stomach muscular, gizzard-like.

Querimana, 3.
Genus 1.-Mugil.
Mugil, (Artedi, Genera, 32) Limnæns, Syst. Nat., ed. x, 1758, 316 (cephalus).
Liza, Jordan \& Swain (subgenus nova) (capito).
The species of the genus seem to fall into two natural groups, the one having the eye largely corered by a transparent adipose eyelid, the other group having the eyelid obsoletc. These groups should apparently rank as subgencra. The type of the genus Mugil, N. cephalus, as now understood, belongs to the first of these groups, which shonld retain the name Mugil. The other group may receive the name of Liza, a name almost universal amoug Spanish-speaking people for the different species of mullet. All the American species belong to the subgenns Mugil, the species of Liza being confined to the Old World. Of the latter group,

Mugil capito Cuvier (our Forskål) may be taken as the type. Some of the species of Liza approach in dentition to Chowomugil, and it is possible that the two groups will be found to intergrade.
Besides the species mentioned below, a species with elongate pectorals, as yet undescribed, has been obtained by Prof. Charles H. Gilbert at Panama. Unfortunately all the known examples of this species have been destroyed by fire.

## ANALYSIS OF AMERICAN SPECIES OF MUGIL.*

a. Eye with a well-developed adipose membrane (subgenus Mugil).
b. Soft dorsal and anal fins almost naked ; anal rays, iii, 8 ; sides with dark longitudiual stripes along the rows of seales; caudal deeply forked; size large.
c. Scales about 33 in a longitudinal series; depth about $4 \frac{1}{2}$ in length to base of candal; teeth very minnte; distance from tip of pectoral to front of dorsal about two-sevenths the length of the pectoral ; lips rather thin
.Liza, 1.
cc. Seales about 40 in il lougitudinal series; depth about 4 in length to base of caudal ; teeth close set, rather swall ; distance of tip of pectoral from front of dorsal about two-ninths length of pectoral
. Cephalus, 2.
bb. Soft dorsal and anal fins sealy; sides without dark stripes along the rows of seales; caudal less deeply forked ; size smaller.
d. Anal rays, iii, 9 ; scales 35 to 45 in a longitudinal series.
$e$. Scales 42 to 45 in a lougitudinal series; teeth small, hair-like ; lips rather thin.................................................................... Incilis, 3.
ee. Scales 35 to 38 in a longitudinal series.
$f$. Pectoral nearly reaching origin of dorsal ; the distance from tip of pectoral to front of dorsal about one-sixth the length of the pectoral; teeth rather wide set, very small, scarcely visible without a lens in the adult ; larger in the joung; scales 35 or 36 in a longitudinal series........................................................... Gaimardianus, 4.
$f f$. Pectoral not nearty reaching origin of dorsal; the distance from tip of pectoral to front of dorsal being in the adult about oue-sixth length of pectoral ; teeth elose set, rather sinall (but distinctly visible without a lens) ; scales 38 or 39 in a longitudinal se-
ries.................................................................... CUREMA, $\overline{5}$.
dd. Anal rays, iii, 8 ; scales very large, abont 33 in a longitudinal series; teeth wide set, larger than in auy other species, about as long as the nostril ; upper lip thick; pectoral not nearly reaching front of dorsal ; size small............................................ Brasiliensis, 6.

1. Mugil liza. Lebrancho. Liza. Querimau.

Mugil liza Cuvier \& Valenciennes, xi, 83, 1836 (Brazil, Porto Rico, Maracaibo, Surinam, Martinique); Jenyns, Zoöl. Beagle, Fıshes, 1842, 80; Guiuther, iii, 423, 1861 (West Indies, British Guiana) ; Goone, Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., 5, 1876, 63 (Bermudas) ; Steindachner, Fisch-Fanna MagdalenenStromes, 1878, 10 (Carthagena, Cannavierias, Victoria, Rio Janeiro, Rio Graude do sul, Maldonado, Montevideo, Puerto San Autonio, Patagonia)
Mugil lebranchus Poer, Memorias, ii, 1860, 260, tab. 18, fig. 3 (Cuba); Poer, Synopsis, 1868, 388 ; Poey, Enumeratio, 1875, 98.

[^0]
## Habitat. Cuba to Patagonia.

Head, 4 in length ( $5 \frac{1}{4}$ including caudal); depth, $4 \frac{4}{7}\left(5 \frac{6}{7}\right)$; D. IV-I, 8 ; A. III, 8. Scales, 12-35. Length, 18 inches.

Body elougate, its depth less than in any other American Mugil. Snout broad and blmitish, the upper profile almost straight and horizontal (in young examples the anterior protile is about equally oblique above and below). Interorbital space gently convex, its width 2 in head. Upper lip rather thin. Space at the chin between the mandibulary bones oblanceolate, acutish posterionly. Preorbital large, almost covering maxillary. Eyes lidden anteriorly and posteriorly by a broad adipose membrane. Teeth very minute.
Scales large, those on top of head larger; abont 21 large scales between origin of dorsal and tip of snout; soft dorsal and anal almost naked. Margin of soft dorsal very concave; the sixth ray shortest, 3 times in second and longest ray. Anal similar to soft dorsal, but slightly less concave. Candal deeply forked.

Color dusky above, silvery below. A dusky streak along each row of scales, this streak not so wide as in M. cephalus. Scales on side and opercle with dark punctulations. Ventrals pale yellowish, the fius otherwise dusky.

This species is abundant in the markets of Havana, where it is usually known as Lebrancho. It has not yet been noticed in the waters of Florida, althougle probably occurring there.

It is readily distinguished from Mugil cephatus and other species with naked dorsal and anal by its large scales.

Its synonymy presents little difficulty. The Cuban form was separated by Poey under the name of Mrugil lelranchus on account of slight discrepancies or errors in the description of Valeuciennes. The species lebranchus has been regarded as doubtful by Poey. There seems, in fact, no reason of importance for thinking liza and lelranchus different.
2. Mugil cephalus. Striped Mullet. Common Mullet. Cefalo. Cephalus. Antiquarum.
Mugil, Artedi, Genera, xxvi, 32, 1738. (Synonymy inchdes several species; description not diagnostic.)

Mugil cephalus, Linneus, Syst. Nat., x, 1758, 316 (based on Artedi) ; Cuv. \& Val., xi, 1836, 19 (Mediterranean); Günther, iii, 1861, 417 (River Niger); (and of European authors generally).
Mugil albula, Linneus, Syst. Nat. xii, 520, 1766 (Charleston); Gmelin, Syst. Nat., 1788, 1398 (copied); Cuv. \& Val., xi, 1836, 96 (New York; De Kay, New York Fanna, Fishes, 1842, 146 (New York); Goode, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mns., 1879, 116 (Saint John's River); Goode \& Bean, op. cit., 18i9, 148 (West Florida); Bean, op. cit., 1380, 102 (Wood's Holl, Newport, Washington Market, North Carolina, Charleston); Johdan \& Jour, op. cit., 1881, 13 (San Diego, Santa Barbara, San Francisco); Jordan © Giliber'f, op. cit., 1881, 143 (Monterey, southwarl); Goode \& Bean; op. cit., 1882, 239 (Gulf of Mexico) ; Jordan \& Gilbert, op cit., 188:, pl. 266, 379, 588 (Charleston, Galveston, Cape San Lucas, Panama): Jordax \& Gilbert: Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1882, 106 (Mazatlan); Jordan © Gilbert, Synopsib. Fishes North America, 1883, 403 (Atlantic coast U. S.), (and of recent American writers generally).

Mugil fang, Beocu, "Ichthyologia, taf. 395," : Mont 1795 (Africa) ; Buoct \& Scunemere, Systema Ichthyologia, 1r01, 115 (copied).
Mugil plumieri, blocu " lelth yologia, taf, 39fi" (Nt. Vincent: on a drawing ber



Sphyrumu phmieri, Bloch is Sounempr, 1chthyolagia, 1-01, 110 , (copied).
Mugil linentus, (Mifcimla), Cuv. \& Val., xi, 96, 1-33 (New York); De Kay,


 ther, iii, $1=(\mathrm{fi}, \mathrm{d} 20$ (Chili).

Muyil berlandieri, Girard, U. S. Mexican Bomdary Survey, 1r59, D0, pl. 10, tig. 1 (St. Joseph's Island, Indianola, Brazos Santiago, Brazos and Galveston, Tex.).
 trall America: not of steimachner).
Mugil meximmus, Stempachaner, Iehthy, Beitrïge, iii. on, 1ais (Acapuleo); Johdan \& Gilbert, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1E-I, Rit (Punta San Ygnacio, Mexico); Jomban \& Ghabert, Sympsis Fishes Nobth America, 1e83, 403 (Pacific coast of U. S., smoth of Point Concerecion).
Mugil cephalotus, Lockington, Amer. Nat., 1879, 305 (California); Stendachner, Ichth. Beitr., x, 39, 1881; (identification of .Mugil mexicanns; probably not Muyil cephatotus C. \&. V., which is a species of Sonthem Asia).

Habitat.-Coasts of Sontheru Emrope and Northem Africa; Atlantic coast of America, from Cape Cod to Brazil ; Pacific coast, from Monterey to Chili (not yet known from Cuba).

Head, $4 \frac{1}{6}\left(5 \frac{1}{3}\right)$; depth, $3 \frac{5}{6}(5)$; D. IV-I, $8 ;$ A. III, 8 (very rarely III, 7 ). Scales, 13-41. Length, $10 \frac{1}{2}$ inches.

Body rather robust, somewhat compressed; its depth moderate. Snont rather narow and acutish, its upper profile little less obligue than lower. Interorbital space slightly convex, $2 \frac{2}{5}$ in head. Upper lip rather thin. Space at the chin between the mandibulary bones oblanceolate, acntish posteriorly. Preorbital narrow, not nearly covering the maxillary. Eyes hidden anteriorly and posteriorly by a broad adipose membrane. Teeth close-set, rather small, but evident. Scales rather small; abont 23 large scales between origin of dorsal and tip of snont; scales on top of head slightly enlarged; soft dorsal and inal, with very few seales. Margin of soft dorsal concave, the seventh ray shortest, $2 \frac{1}{2}$ times in length of second or longest ray ; anal similar to soft dorsal, but less soncare. Pectoral reaching nearly to front of spinons dorsal. Candal deeply forked.

Color dark bluish above; sides silvery, with conspicnous dark stripes along each row of scales; pale yellowish below. Ventrals yellowish, the other fins dusky.

This is the common mnllet of our South Atlantic and Gulf coast, in which region it is one of the most abundant and important food-fishes. It is equally abmulant along the coast of Sonthern Califoruia and
southward. In tropical America it seems to be less abundant, and in Cuba it has not yet been fonnd. In the Merliterrauean it is also an abundant food-fish, although probably less common than Mugil cur. (crupito).

We have carefully compared specimens of this type from Venice (Wugil cephalus), from various points on the east coast of the United States (Mugil albula=lineatus), from California and Mexico 〈Mugil mexicanus), and from Chili (IIugil rammelsbergi). They agree fully in form, color, fin-rays, squanations, dentition, and we find ourselves entirely mable to point out any distinctive characters among them at all likely to be permanent. We therefore regard them as a single species. Varietal names could be giveu to specimens from these different localities by any one so disposed, but at present we know of no characters to mark such varieties.

As to the symonymy a few words may be necessary.
The name cephalus was based on a long description by Artedi of some mullet, the habitat not stated. This description contains nothing distinctive; lont, on the whole, it seems to point to the present species, which was the cephalus of the Romans, and is still the Céfalo of the Italians. Valenciennes, however, thinks that Artedi's fish was probably the Mugil seur (capito), becanse of this expression: "oculi nulla cute communi tecti," "an expression which he would certainly not have employed if he had examined the eyes of a true cophalus."

But this seems to me not so sure. Even in the species with the adipose eyelid, the eye is not covered by the common skin of the head, the pupil being naked.

The Mugil cephalus of Cur. \& Val., and of all later writers is the present species.

The Mugil albula, which first appears in the twelfth edition of the Systema Nature, is based on a fish sent from Charleston, by Dr. Garden. This specimen has been examined by Messrs. Goode and Bean, and identified with the present species.
The names plumicri and lineatus undonbtedly belong to this species, as also that of berlandieri.

Mugil rammelsbergi is the representative of this form on the Pacitic coast of South America. It is regarded as different by Giinther and Steindachuer, but our specimens show no tangible distinctive characters.

The descriptiou of Mugil giintheri does not fully agree with M. cephulus. The discrepancies are probably due to the small size or poor condition of the original type, which is now lost.

Mugil mexicanus does not appear to differ at all from the Atlantic form. The original type had seven soft rays in the anal, but the normal number in the California mullet is right. Lockington and Steindachner have since identified this species with Mugil cephalotus, C. \& V., from Southern Asia. There is nothing in the descriptions of the latter spe-
cies to forbid this identification, but we prefer not to unite cephalotus with cephatus until Asiatic specimens are compared. If they are really the same, Mugil cephalus is a cosmopolitan species, like Elops saurus, Albula vulpes, and other similar forms.

If the identification of Mugil cephalus, L. with this species be regarded as meertain, the name Mrugil allula, concerning which no doubt exists, should be used.

## 3. Mugil platanus.

Mugil platamus, Günther, Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist., July, 1880, 9. (Bnenos Ayres.)
Habitat.-Coast of Buenos Ayres. This species, brietly described by Dr. Giinther, is closely related to Mugil ccphalus. The scales appear to be larger (lat. l. 38), the head broader, the interorbital width being half the length of the head. The coloration is not described, so that we camnot say whether this is striped like M. cephalus and M. lizu or not.
4. Mugil incilis. Treuch Mullet.

Mugil incilis, Hancock, Lond. Quart. Journ. Sc., 1830, 127 (Gniana); GÜnther, Fishes Central America 1809, 44:3, (Dutcl and British Gniana; Chagres River) ; Steindachner, Fisch Fama Magrlalmen-Stromes, 1878, 10 (Rio Magdalena, San Doningo, Demerara, Maranhañ. Pari, Caneta Porto de Moz, Bahia, San Matheos, Chiapam) ; Joman \& Ghbert, Proe. U. S. Nat. Mus., 18-2, 624 (Pamama); Jordan \& Ghlbert, Bull. U. S. Fish Comm. 1822, 109 (Ранана).
Mugil gïntheri, steindaciner, Notizen, i, 1:, 1864 (British Guiana).
Habitat.-Antilles, northern coasts of South America, both coasts of Central America, ascending the streams.
This species appears to be abmond on both coasts of tropical America. We have, however, seen but a single specimen. This is in the museum of Yale College, having been obtained at Panama. It is very well dis. tinguished from Alugil curcma by the small size of the scales.
As already remarked by Steindachner, the long description by Hancock of his "Trench Mullet" (Mugil incilis) * contains nothing distine-

[^1]tive except that the anal rays are III, 9 , and the seales are much smaller than in the "Queriman" (Mugil liza). These statements are equally true of M. curema and M. gaimardianus. As, however, Dr. Giinther has received numerons specimens from British Guiana, he may have some good reasou for retaining Hancock's name for this species, rather than tc regard it as a synonym of curema.
The name of gientheri, given to this species by Steindachner, is preoccupied in this genus.
5. Mugil gaimardianus. Red-eye Mullet; Liza Ojo de Perdriz.

Mugil gaimardianus, Desmarest, Dict. Class, 1831, tab. 109, (ne description); Poey, Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist., N. Y., 1875, 64, tab. 7., fig. 1-3 (Cuba); Poey, Enumeratio, 1875, 99.
Habitat.-Cuba, Florida Keys.
Head, 4 (51 4 ) ; lepth, $3 \frac{3}{5}\left(4 \frac{3}{4}\right)$. D. IV, I, 8 ; A. III, 9. Scales 11-35 or 36. Length, 11 inches.

Body rather robust, moderately compressed. Snont rather narrow and pointed, upper profile almost as oblique as lower. Interorbital space convex, $2 \frac{1}{4}$ in head. Upper lip rather thick, abont as in M. curema. Space at the chin between the mandibulary bones, elliptical, acutish in front and behind, scarcely longer than snout. Preorbital rather narrow, covering about half of the maxillary. Eyes hidden anteriorly and posteriorly by a broad adipose membrane. Teeth rather wide-set, very small, not visible without the aid of a lens. Scales in the adult rather large, evident in the young, about 20 in a line from origin of spinous dorsal to tip of snont ; soft dorsal and anal, densely scaly. Soft dorsal concave on its margin; the seventh ray shortest, 2t in second or longest ray. Anal similar to soft dorsal but more concare. Pectoral reaching very nearly to front of spinous dorsal. Caudal forked.

Color dusky above, with bluish reflections, silvery below, no dusky streaks along sides. Spinous and soft dorsal dusky, the latter finely
distinction between the queriman and trench mnllet appears to be in the anal fin and the scales on the back of the head, the anal fin in the queriman having only 11 , white the trench mullet has constantly 12 rays. The seates on the back of the head of the former are marked with concentric circles, but the trench mullet shows no trace of this character; its scales are smaller and quite smooth; the head is not so angular, is less flattenerl, of a light color, and is more delicate in appearance, i.e., taking a tull-grown trench millet and a querimau of the same size for comparisom, the scales in the latter are stonter and muel more developed. But in these respects you require to compare them together to olserve the difference, and that with somewhat careful attontion, heing so near alike that many think them the same species, that the mullet is the joung of the queriman. The lijs are protractile in both. I observe very fine setie in the lips in both species, but less crowded in the mullet than in the queriman. The body of the mullet is more soft and flexible than in the queriman, and its taste is also different, having a peenliar, delicate flavor, different from that of other fishes. It has a gall-bladler very small and oval ; the queriman has a large, ohlong, pointed gall-bladder. In both the liver is situated close to the anterior part of the stomach. The Guiana mullets have 24 lorsal vertebre ; that is, if we include the fan-shaped bone of the tail."
punctulate with brown, its anterior rays tipped with black. Caudal pale, broadly margined with black. Anal pale, its basal half appearing dusky from dark punctulations. Pectoral pale in front, rather dusky behind, where there is a dusky blotel at base.

The above description is taken from a specimen from Cuba. Numerous small specimens from Key West entirely agree with it, except that the teeth are larger, being distinctly risible in both jaws. The body is less compressed and the color lighter.

Little is known of the distribution of this species. It is recorded by Poey as rather rare at Havana. Several specimens were obtained there by Professor Jordan. The young are also common at Key West, where the species is known as Red-eje Mullet.

In Jordan's list of the fishes of Key West in the current colume of the Proceedings, U. S. Nat. Mus. this species was improperly omitterl, the joung specimens above referred to having been overlooked.

This species is not describel by Desmarest and the name gaimardianus should date from its use by Poey.
6. Mugil curema. White mullet; Bhue-hach mullet; Liza.

Albula buhamensis (ihe Mullet), Catesby, Nat. Hist. Carolina, 1738, taf. 6 (Bahamas).
Mugil curema, Cuv. \& Val., xi, 1236, ei (Brazil, Martinique, Cula) ; ? Gay, "Hist. Chil., Zoöl., ii, 184", 250."
Mugil petrosus, Cuv. \& Val., vi, 183f, $\varepsilon 9$ (Brazil, Surinam, Gulf of Mexico, Cuba) ; De Kay, New York Fanna, 184\%. 146 (copied).
Mugil braziliensis, (iëxture, iii, 431, 1861 (Vera Cruz, Ean Domingo, Jamaica, St. Vincent, British Guiana, Surinan, Para) ; Günthfr, Fishes Central America, 1869, $44:$ (Belize, Chiapam, Panania) ; Cope, Trans. Amer. Philos. Soc., 1sion, $4^{\text {®1 }}$ (St. Croix, New Providence) ; Jordan \& Ghlbert, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1878,381 and 322 (Beanfort Harhor) ; Stemindachner, Fisch-Fauna Magdalenen-Stromes, 18i8, 10 ; Stenndachner, Beitrigge III, 1878, 60 (Rio Janeirn, Cannarierias, Campos, Mendez, Santa Cruz, Porto Alegre, Porto Seguro, Muriahe, Pernambuco, Ceárá, Bahia, Rio Pará, Cartharena, St. Thomas, Panama, Acapulco, Magdalenaı Bay) ; Goone, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1879, 116 (Saint John's River) ; Gonde \& Bean, op. c., 1879 (West Florida) ; Jordas, op. c., 1880, 20 (East Florida) ; Jordan \& Gilbert, op. c., 1881, pp. 232, 233, 274,277 (Porto Escondido, Mex. ; La Union, San Salvador; Guaymas; Mulege, Lower Cal.); Goode \& Bean, op. c., $108 \%, 239$ (Gulf of Mexico); Jordax \& Gllbert, op. c., 188\%, 1p. 2.38, 374, 379, 528 , 0.24 (Cape San Lucas, Colima, Panama, Charleston); Jordan \& Gilbert, Bull. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1882, 106, 109, 112 (Mazatlan, Panama, Punta Arenas); Jordax \& Gilbert, Synopsis Fishes North America, 403, 1983 (Cape Cod to South America and Lower California) ; Pofy, Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. New York, 1875, xi, 61, tal. 7 (Cuba) ; Poey, Enumeratio, 1875, 99 ; Jordan, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mins., 1884 (Key West). (Not of Agrassiz \& $S_{p i x}$ )
Mugil lineatus, Storfer, Hist. Fishes Mass., 1867, 167, pl. 16, f. 4. (Not of Mitchill.)
Habitat.-Atlantic coast of America from Cape Cod to Brazil; Pacific coast of America from Magdalena Bay to Chili.
 Length, $11 \frac{1}{3}$ inches.

Body moderately elongate, its depth about equaling that of $M$. ceph. alus. Snout rather narrow and pointed, the upper profile not so oblique as lower. Interorbital space slightly convex, $2 \frac{4}{9}$ in head. Upper lip rather thick. Space at the chin between the mandibulary bones oblanceolate, acutish posteriorly. Preorbital rather narrow, nearly covering the maxillary posteriorly. Eyes hidden anteriorly and posteriorly by a broad adipose membrane. Teeth thick-set, rather sinall, but distinctly visible to the naked eye. Scales rather small, aloont 23 from origin of dorsal to tip of suout; soft dorsal and anal densely scaled. Soft dorsal slightly concave; the serenth and shortest ray $2 \frac{1}{3}$ in second or longest ray. Anal similar to soft dorsal. Pectoral falling short of spinous dorsal by a distance equal to one-third its length in adult, sometimes longer in young. Caudal forked. Color dark olive above, with some bluish reflections; silvery below. No dusky streaks along sides. A rather small dark blotch at base of pectoral, Spinons and soft dorsal and pectorals pale, with numerous small dark punctulations. Candal pale, yellowish at base; margin of fin blackish. Anal and ventrals yellowish.

This species is very widely distributed in tropical Ameriea, being very abundant throughout that region, and equally so on both sides of the continent. We find no difference whatever betreen Atlantic and Pacific specimens.

This is the species ealled Mugil brasiliensis by all recent writers. It is, however, certainly not the original Mrugil brasiliensis of Agassiz.

Dr. A. Spangenberg, curator of the museum at Munich, in which institution the types of Agassiz and Spix are preserved, has kindly given us the following information coneerning the types of Mugil brasiliensis. The following is a translation of a portion of Dr. Spangenberg's letter:
"The badly preserved dried example ( 400 millimeters long) seems to me to be certainly the one figured by Spix, but on this oue it is entirely impossible to count the number of anal rays, since the fin is dried down. The distance from the end of the pectoral to the beginning of the dorsal, after allowis:g for the broken tip of the pectoral, is a good third of the length of the pectoral. The number of scales in a longitudinal series is 32. Teeth, so far as visible, of moderate size. This original type thus best fits your species 1. (=Mugil trichodon Poer).
"Besides this dried example, which best fits the figure in the above named work (Agassiz and Spix), if it does not wholly agree with it, we have in a bottle of spirits two other specimens labelled Mugil brasiliensis Spix, which do not resemble the figure and the dried specimen, and, in fact, each of them is a distinct species, so that, under the same label, we have three distinct species.
"Of these the larger specimen shows the following peenliarities: Anal, II1, 9. Scales of the lateral line, 35 . Distance of the end of the pectoral
from the beginuing of the dorsal，one third the length of the pectoral （nearly 1．20：3．70）．Small teeth．This form agrees with your species 2 （Mugil gaimardianus），except in the distance of the pectoral from the dorsal．
＂The small example，in its whole appearance quite unlike the preced－ ing，shows：Anal，III，9．Scales， 38 or 39．Distance of the end of the pectoral from the dorsal very slight（about one－twelfth of the length of the pectoral，nearly ．03 to ．34）；teeth large，absolutely larger than in the preceding larger fish．
＂This animal differs from your species 3 （Mugil curema＝brasiliensis Auct．）again in the distance of the pectoral from the dorsal．To con－ clurle：Only the dried example agrees exactly with your species 1 （tri－ chodon），（except in the number of anal rays，which cannot be counted）， and this example is certainly the one originally figured by $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{ix}$（I have also asked Professor Zittle to verify this），the discrepancies of the figure being the fault of the artist．＂

In any case，therefore，whatever the two smaller specimens collected by Spix and referred to M．brasiliensis by Agassiz，may prove to be，it is evident that the original type of Mrugil brasiliensis does not belong to the species called by the latter name by Giinther，Steindachner，and other recent writers．There can be little doubt，in fact，of its identity with Mugil trichodon Poey，for which reason we here retain for the latter species the name Mugil brasiliensis．

Mrugil curema is doubtless the present species，as I am informed by Dr．Sauvage that the type preserved in the museum at Paris has 40 seales in a lougitudinal series．

Mugil petrosus is to all appearance also the same species，some of the specimens（New York）being certainly the same．

Mugil platanus，Giinther is identified by Steindachner with this spe－ cies，the presence of but 8 soft rays in the anal fin being regarded as accidental．As，however，in M．platanus，the dorsal and anal fins are said to be naked，it is probably most nearly related to M．cephalus，of which it may be a variety．

## 7．Mugil brasiliensis．Fan－tail mullet．

Mugil brasiliensis，Agassiz，Spix，Pisc．Brasil．，1829，234，tab． 72 （Brazil） （typical example；not the two smaller ones）．
Mugil trichodon，Poey，Ann．Lyc．Nat．Hist．New York，1875，xi，66，tab．8， f．4－8（Cuba）；Poey，Enumeratio，1875， 99 ；Jordan，Proc．U．S．Nat Mus．， 1884 （Key West）．
Habitat．－Cuba，Florida Kess，Brazil．Head， $4 \frac{1}{5}$（54⿱亠䒑⿱亠䒑 $)$ ；depth， $3 \frac{2}{3}$ （42）．D．IV，I，8．A．III，S；Scales，11－33．Length， 11 inches．

Body rather robust，its depth somewhat greater than in M．curema． Snout rather narrow and pointed，the upper and lower profile about equally oblique．Interorbital space flattish or slightly convex， $\mathfrak{2 l}_{2}^{2}$ in head．Upper lip thick；thicker than in any other species here de－ scribed．Space at the chin between the mandibulary bones oblanceo－
late, acutish posteriorly. Preorbital narrow, covering little of maxillary. Eyes hidden anteriorly and posteriorly by a broad adipose membrane. Teeth wide-set; larger than in the other species; plainly visible in both jaws, and about as long as the nostril. Scales large, about 21 from origin of dorsal to tip of snout; soft dorsal and anal densely scaled. Soft dorsal concave; the seventh ray shortest, $23 \frac{3}{4}$ in second or longest ray; anal similar to soft dorsal. Pectoral not reaching nearly to front of spinous dorsal. Caudal broad, forked.

Color dusky olive above, with some bluish reflections; silvery below. No dusky streaks along the rows of scales. A dark blotch at base of pectoral. Dorsals and candal pale, the former with very small dark punctulations. Caudal margined with blackish. Anal and ventrals yellowish. Pectorals pale, finely punctulate with brown.

This little mullet is very abundant at Key West, where it is known as fan-tail mullet. At Cuba it is reported as rare by Poey. It has not been noticed elsewhere. Numerous specimens, large and small, are in our collection, none of them quite a foot in length.

The reasons for adopting for this species the name of brasiliensis instead of that of trichodon are stated under Mugil curema.

Measurements.

| Name of species <br> Locality | Liza. <br> Havana. |  | Oephalus. Cedar Key. |  | Incilis. Copied. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Inches and 100ths. |  | Inches and 100ths. | $\begin{gathered} \text { 100ths } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { longth. } \end{gathered}$ | Inches and 100ths | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100ths } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { length. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Estreme length. | 18.00 |  | 10.55 |  | 7.00 |  |
| Length to base of caudal | 14.10 |  | 8.60 |  | 5.6 |  |
| Body : <br> Greatest height. $\qquad$ |  | 22 |  |  |  | 22 |
| Greatest width .. |  | 19 |  | 17 |  | 2 |
| Head: |  | - |  |  |  |  |
| Greatest length. |  | 26 |  | 24 |  | 22 |
| Greatest width |  | 18 |  | 18 |  | 14 |
| Width of intererbital area |  | 13 | , | 10 |  | 9 |
| Length of snout |  | $5 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | - |  |  |
| Dersal (spinous) : <br> Distance from snout |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distance from snout............................... From tip of pectoral to origin of dorsal |  | 48 5 |  | 50 |  |  |
| Height at first spine.......................... |  | 12 |  | 14 |  | 13 |
| Height at first and longest ray of soft dorsal |  | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | 13 |  |  |
| Ueight at last ray ........................... |  | $7 \times$ |  | 7 |  |  |
| Anal: Lencth of base |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of base ................ |  | 12 |  | 12 |  | 10 |
| Height at first and longest ray Height at last ray ........... |  | $12 \frac{1}{2}$ |  | 15 |  |  |
| Height at last ray Caudal |  | 7 |  | 7 |  |  |
| Caudal: <br> Length of middle rays |  | 14 |  | 14 |  |  |
| Length of upper lobe. |  | 30 |  | 25 |  | 25 |
| Pectoral: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ventral: |  | 18 |  | 19 |  |  |
| Length |  | 15 |  | 15 |  | 16 |
| Dorsal | IV, I, 8 |  | IV, I, 8 |  | IV, $\mathrm{I}, 8$ |  |
| Anal | III, 8 |  | III, 8 |  | III, 9 |  |
| Number of scales in lateral line....................... |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| dorsal to ventrals $\qquad$ | 12 |  | 13 |  | 14 |  |

Measurements-Continned.

| Name of species <br> Loeality | Gaimardianus. Havana. |  | Curema. <br> Ker West. |  | Brasiliensis. Key West. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Inches } \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { 100ths. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \text { ths } \\ \text { of } \\ \text { length. } \end{gathered}$ | Inches and 100ths. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 100ths } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { length. } \end{aligned}$ | Inches and 100ths | $\begin{aligned} & \text { looths } \\ & \text { of } \\ & \text { leugth. } \end{aligned}$ |
| Extreme leugth | 11.00 |  | 11.30 |  | 11.00 |  |
| Length to base of candal | 8.50 |  | 9.10 |  | 8.60 |  |
| Body: <br> Greatest heisht |  | 28 |  | 26 |  | 28 |
| Greatest width |  | 15 |  | 16 |  | 16 |
| Head: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Greatest leugth |  | 26 |  | 23 |  | 24 |
| Greatest wilth |  | 17 |  | 15. |  | $16 \frac{1}{3}$ |
| Width of interorbital area |  | $11 \frac{1}{8}$ |  | 94 |  | 10 |
| Length of ssout |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 41 |
| Dorsal (spinous) : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distauce from spout. |  | 50 3 |  | 50 |  | 51 |
| Height at first spinetoral to origin of do |  | 14 |  | 13 |  | 15 |
| Height at first and longest ray of soft dorsal |  | 14 |  | 12 |  | 13 |
| Height at last ray ................... |  | 7 |  | 61 |  | $6{ }^{3}$ |
| Anal: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length of base ............... |  | 15 |  | 131 |  | 12 |
| Height at first and longest ray Height at last ray ........... |  | 15 |  | 12 |  | 13 |
| Height at last ray Candal: |  | 7 |  | 6 |  | $6 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Leugth of niddle rars |  | 18 |  | 16 |  | 16 |
| Length of upper lobe |  | 31 |  | 29 |  | 29 |
| Pectoral: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leugth |  | 19 |  | 18 |  | 17 |
| Ventral: <br> Length |  | 16 |  | 14 |  | 15 |
| Dorsal .... | IV, 1,8 |  | IV,I, 8 |  | IV.I. 8 |  |
| Anal. | III', 9 |  | III, 9 |  | IIİ, 8 |  |
| Number of scales in lateral line | 36 |  | 38 |  |  |  |
| Number of seales in transverse row from spinous dorsal to rentrals | 11 |  | 12 |  | 11 |  |

Genus 2.-Chenomugil.
Chænomugil, Gill, Proc. Ac. Nat. Sci., Phila., 1863, 169 (proboscidens).
But one species of this genns is known. This is allied to some species of the subgenus Liza, such as the European Mugil chelo and others with thickened lips and enlarged papillæ in more than one series. Unless, however, a more perfect gradation exists than is now known, it should be regarded as constituting a distinct genus, for which the hybrid name Chanomugil must be used.
8. Chænomugil proboscideus.

Mugil proboscideus, Günther, Cat. Fishes, iii, 459, 1861 (Island of "Cordovia" [Cardon], West Coast Central America).
Chenomugil (proboscidens), Gill, Proc. Ac. Nat. Sci., Phila., 1863, 169 (Generic (liagnosis) ; Jordan \& Gilbert, Bull. U. S. Fish Comm., 1882, 106, 109 (Mazatlan, Panama).
Habitat.-Pacific coast of tropical America, Mazatlan, Cardon, Panama.

This small mullet reaches a length of four or five inches, and is not uncommon on the Pacific Coast of Mexico and Central America. I suppose the island of "Cordova," whence Dr. Giuther obtained his typical

## 

specimens, to be a slip of the pen for Cardon. If this is true, the species is not known from the Atlantic.

The numerons specimens collected by Professor Gilbert having been destroyed by fire, we are unable to add anything to Dr. Giinther's account, which is sufficiently full aud aceurate.

## Gemus 3.-Querminana.

Querimana, Jordan \& Gilbert, Proc. U. S. Nat. Mus., 1882, 588 (harengu8).
This genus inclurles little mullets, some of them of very small size, with distinct teeth in the jaws rather than cilia, and with but two spines in the anal fin. In this last regard they differ from the genns Myxus, Guinther, which has three anal spines. The species, so far as known, are all American, and are very closely related. We refer Mugil curvidens provisionally to this genus, not laving seen its type. It may, however, prove to belong to Myxus.

## ANALYSIS OF SPECIES OF QUERIMANA.

a. Teeth in lower jaw distinet ; anal rays II, 9 or II, 10 .
b. Teeth unusually strong, those in the lower jaw directed downwards and forwards, like those in the upper............................................... Curvidens, 9.
bb. Teeth feebler, rather ciliiform, the lower not curved downwards. Culilabis, 10. $a a$. Teeth in lower jaw obsolete; species of very stwall size.
c. Anal rays II, 9 or II, 10 ; lat., l. ,38

Harengus, 11.
cc. Anal rass II, 7 ; lat. 1 ., 29 or 30

Gribans, 12.
9. Querimana curvidens.

Mugil curvidens, Cuv. \& Val., xi, 1836, 149, pl. 313 (Asceusion, Bahia). Myxus curvidens, GÜnther, iii, 1861, 467 (copied).
Habitat.-Island of Ascension, Bahia.
Nothing is known of this species except what is contained in the original description.
10. Querimana ciliilabis.

Mugil ciliilabis, Cuv. \& Val., xi, 1836, 151 (Callao).
Myxus ciliilabis, Günther, iii, 1861, 467 (copied) Steindachner.
Querimana cililabis, Jordan, Proc. Ac. Nat. Sci. Philia., 1883, 283 (Callao).
Habitat.-Coast of Peru.
The original types of this species in the musenm at Paris have been examined by Professor Jordan. The species is very close to Q. harengus, differing in the rather stronger dentition, stiffened cilia or teeth being present in both jaws, rather strongest in the upper. Head, $3 \frac{2}{5}$ in length; depth, $4 \frac{1}{4}$; no adipose eyelid; preorbital serrate ; anal spines, 2 ; first soft ray of anal simple, but evidently articulate.

Proc. Nat. Mus. $84-18$

## 11．Querimanatharongus．Eil Verte．







Mabital．－Mavatlan，P＇anama，Peru．
This Sitt！，fish is ahmmdant，hoth at Ma\％atlan and Panama．It is rec－ ognized by the fishermen as a distimet spereies，and at Mazatlan，from ins clear green color．It is known as Lle Verde．

1）s．（iiathoss original types，like all the other specimens examined by us，have but two spines in the anal fin．

## 12．Querimana gyrans．




Inabitat．－Oharleston，Kry West．
＇This curious little fish，thes smatlest of known mullets，is abundant abont，Key West，and a fow sperimens have been taken at Charleston． We venture the prediction that，in timo，it will be found to be abomdant thronghont the West Indies．It may，however，be easily confounded with the young mullets，althongh its hathits are altogether different from those of the latter．

Nominal specics arranged in ehronological order with identificationн．

|  | Yerar． | dionuliflention． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mugil requrilu＊，lifuntriar | 1768 | Mugif roplalıaн． |
| M | 17615 | 1 l \％． |
| Mugll litug，lilmb | 1795 | 1）： |
| Mngil parnicrly Alocin | 179\％ | 110． |
| Mupil liranliarzin，$\Lambda$ grasmi\％ | 18211 | Mugil 万uтallicusín． |
| Mugis iumilix．Inamourls． | 1 Hill | （7）Mugil Inclis． |
| Muц\｜lizu，liov．© Vul | 18is！ | Mugil Hzat． |
| Muцil llucitum，Mlxalıli | 18ill | Mukil edshalum． |
|  |  | Mugil curesmit． |
|  | 1 HiN1 | $11 \%$. |
| Mugil curvidenn，fiuvo de Val | 1830 | Qucrimana（3）＂иrvidesta． |
| Mugil cilidubin，（iuv．© Vml | 18ils |  |
|  | 181．\％ | Dıgil copplabur． |
|  | 1850 | 130． |
|  | 1880 | Mugil liza． |
|  | 18111 |  |
|  | I Butis | Stigll ceplablon． |
|  | 1816.5 |  |
| Magll Prichorlmi，I＇osy ．．． | 1476 | Mugil brasillonimas． |
|  | 1876 | Mぃц＇l gitummllatus． |
|  | 1878 |  |
|  | 1878 | I） |
|  | 1581 |  |
|  | 16H： |  |

## にBOAJI＇TUJATION．

We home reprat the list of nperies ferognized by us，with a brief state－
 of eath species is indicated by thas leters $U$（sonth $A$ flantic coment of

United States), C (California), W (western Atlantic, West Indies, Brazil), E (Europe), A (Western Africa), B (southern coast of Brazil and southward), P (Pacific coast of Mexico and Central America), G (western coast of South America).

> Genus 1.-Mugil, (Artedi) Linnæus.

1. Mugil liza, Cuv. \& Val. (W.).
2. Mugil cephalus, L. (E.) (cephalus), (A.) (cephalus), (U. W.)(albula), (C. P.)(güntheri= mexicanus), (G.) (rammelsbergi), (Asia ? ) (cephalotus). (Possibly divisible into geographical subspecies.)
3. Mugil platanus, Günther. (B.) (Species not sufficiently known.)
4. Mugil incilis, Hancock. (W. P.) (Identification of name incilis somewhat doubtful.)
5. Mugil curema, Cuv. \& Val. (U. W. B. P. G.).
6. Mugil gaimardianus, (Desmarest) Poey (W. U ).
7. Mugil brasiliensis, Agassiz (W. U.).

> Genus 2.-Chenomugil, Gill.
8. Chanomugil proboscideus, Günther (P.).

Genus 3.-Querimana, Jordan \& Gilbert.
9. Querimana? curvidens, C. \& V. (A.W.). (Species unknown to us; of uncertain genus.)
10. Querimana ciliilabis, C. \& V. (G.).
11. Querimana harengus, Günther (P. G.). (Possibly young of Q. ciliilabis $\%$ ).
12. Querimana gyrans, Jordan \& Gilbert (U.).

SYNOPSIS OF THE GENERA OF THE SUPERFAMILY TEUTHIDOIDEA (FAMILIES TEUTHIDID屈 AND SIGANID屈).

By THEODORE GILL.
Having recently had occasion to inquire into the relations and characteristics of the constituents, and into the applicability of the names employed for the genera of the family "Teuthyes" of Cuvier, I was obliged to dissent from the taxonomic views as well as nomenclature most in vogue, and have reached the conclusions embodied in the following synopsis. The changes of nomenclature have invariably been made in obedience to the rules of the British and American associations for the advancement of science. Those who are lawless, or follow rules only when they suit their purpose or convenience, will doubtless disapiprove of the changes. The necessity for the changes has been appreciated by Messrs. Jordan, Meek, and Bean, and the first two had independently reached the same conclusion with reference to the Teuthis hepatus.


[^0]:    * Mugil platanus Giinther, a species which we have not seen, is omitted in this analysis.

[^1]:    * The following is Dr. Hancock's original deseription: "In the Trench Mullet (Mugil incilis), as we may designate this species (being ehiclly found in the trenches or ditehes dug for draining the flat lands of the coast of Guianal), the seales are small; the anal fin has 12 rays; grows to 8 or 10 inches in length; is of a highter color than the queriman, lont otherwise differs very little from a young dueriman of the same size; the structure of the stomach is also the same, being a sort of gizzard. Like the latter fish, it lives entirely by suction. It delights in water that is slightly brackish; and althongl it is often fomd on the coast, yet a sudden inmersion in seawater soon kills it. I once observed at Cape Batave (the property of Mr. Gilgens), on the west coast of Essequibo, great numbers of mullets swimming with their heads or snouts out of the water. On inquiry I fonnd that the front dan had given way in the night from a high spring tide, and nearly filled the trenches with salt water. It appears extraordinary that this fish, although it constantly inhabits fresh-water trenches, is never found (not to my knowledge at least) in the natmal ponls or rivilets of fresh water; and $I$ am not certain whether it is ever fomul in the proper salt water of the ocean, for the water of the coast is seldom very sall, \&c. The only obvious

